



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,258	12/15/2000	Ephraim Feig	SOM919990019US1(1963-7360	8747

7590 03/31/2005

WILLIAM E. LEWIS
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/736,258	FEIG, EPHRAIM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/23/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-57 are presented for examination.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I invention (i.e., claims 1-15) in the reply filed on 8/29/2004 is acknowledged. In response to the applicant's remarks, "In the event the outstanding restriction requirement is not withdrawn, Applicant thereby elects with traverse the claims of Group I, i.e., claims 1-15, for prosecution on the merits, and hereby cancels without prejudice claims 16-57", examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claims 16-57. Hence, applicant is requested to submit the listing of claims containing "cancelled" as the identifier for the claims 16-57. Examiner examines the applicant election Group I invention (i.e., claims 1-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, recites the limitations, "the consecutive groups", "the client", "the converted groups", "the stripped groups". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the

claim. Since, multiple groups and clients exist in the claim it is not clear which groups and client is referred by theses limitations.

Claim 2, recites the limitations, “ the rate at which consecutive frames”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claims 4, 5, 12 and 14, recite the limitations, “ the group”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 6, recites the limitations, “the consecutive groups”, “the stripped consecutive groups”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple groups exist in the claim it is not clear which groups is referred by theses limitations.

Claim 10, recites the limitations, “the entire multimedia file”, “the number of requests”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple clients exist in the claim it is not clear which client is referred by theses limitations.

Claims 11 and 13, recites the limitations, “the rate of sending”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple clients exist in the claim it is not clear which client is referred by theses limitations.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

The following title is suggested: “Application server and streaming server streaming multimedia file in a client specific format”.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, Paper dated 10/23/2001, is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 4, 5, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day et al., IBM, 5,996,015 (Hereinafter Day-IBM) in view of Saxena et al., 5,805,821, IBM (Hereinafter Saxena-IBM).

8. As per claim 1, Day-IBM clearly teaches a method for transferring multimedia data (e.g., col., 5, lines 35 – 53, col., 6, lines 26 – 60, figure 2) using a data communication system (e.g., figure 1) comprising the steps of:

storing on an application server (e.g., col., 4, lines 42 – 55, figure 2) a multimedia file including a plurality groups of multimedia data (e.g., col., 6, lines 45 - 64);
receiving a client request at the application server (e.g., col., 5, lines 40 - 51);
transferring (e.g., col., 3, lines 12 – 51) to a streaming server (e.g., col., 3, lines 12 – 38, figures 1 and 2) information from the buffer (e.g., col., 4, lines 42 – 55, figures 1 and 2),

converting (e.g., col., 6, lines 21 – 25) at the streaming server (col., 3, lines 19 – 26, figures 1 and 2), each of the media information received from the buffer (e.g., col., 4, lines 42 – 55, figures 1 and 2) into a format readable by the at least one client apparatus (e.g., col., 5, lines 36 - 48), and

sending each of the converted groups to the at least one client apparatus (e.g., col., 5, lines 7 - 29).

However, Day-IBM does not specifically mention about each group having a predetermined data size, reading a client address corresponding to at least one client apparatus, stripping consecutive groups and buffering the stripped groups in a staging buffer.

Saxena-IBM discloses the well-known concept of each group having a predetermined data size (e.g., col., 31, lines 1 – 41, figures 16 - 21), reading a client address corresponding to at least one client apparatus (e.g., col., 22, lines 3 – 40, figures 7, 11), stripping consecutive groups (e.g., col., 31, lines 1 – 41, figures 16 - 21) and buffering the stripped groups in a staging buffer (e.g., col., 8, lines 44 - 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM with the teachings of Saxena-IBM in order to facilitate each group having a predetermined data size, reading a client address corresponding to at least one client apparatus, stripping consecutive groups and buffering the stripped groups in a staging buffer because the stripping of the consecutive groups would help select necessary data. The stripped data would help the software to process the information to support the client. The staging buffer would help store stripped information in a consecutive manner. Group having a

Art Unit: 2154

predetermined data size would help the software to process data for the client. The client address would help the device to support transfer of data to the client.

9. As per claim 4, Day-IBM also teaches the at least one client apparatus is selected from the group consisting of: a personal computer, a fax machine, a hard drive, a telephone interface, a wireless telephone, a radio receiver, and a personal digital assistant (e.g., figures 1 and 2).

10. As per claim 5, Day-IBM also teaches the multimedia file is selected from the group consisting of: video files, music files, computer generated graphics files, still image files, and sound files (e.g., col., 6, lines 15 – 30, col., 3, lines 18 - 24).

11. Claims 2, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM in view of Akeley, Silicon Graphics, 5,933,155 (Hereinafter Akeley-Silicon-Graphics).

12. As per claims 2 and 3, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. Day-IBM also teaches the multimedia file is a video file / MPEG format (e.g., col., 3, lines 18 - 24). However, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM do not specifically mention about multimedia data comprises a video frame, each frame corresponds to a frame display duration, and the rate at which consecutive frames are transferred to a device from the buffer corresponds to intervals of each display duration.

Akeley-Silicon-Graphics discloses the well-known concept of multimedia data comprises a video frame (e.g., figures 1-3, col., 3, line 26 – col., 4, line 64), each frame corresponds to a

Art Unit: 2154

frame display duration (e.g., figures 1-3, col., 3, line 26 – col., 4, line 64), and the rate at which consecutive frames are transferred to a device from the buffer corresponds to intervals of each display duration (e.g., figures 1-3, col., 3, line 26 – col., 4, line 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM with the teachings of Akeley-Silicon-Graphics in order to facilitate a multimedia data comprises a video frame corresponding to a frame display duration and the rate at which consecutive frames are transferred to a device from the buffer correspond to intervals of each display duration because the video frame display duration information would help software to handle the video frame for the client. The rate at which the consecutive frames are transferred would help software for adjusting the video information provided to the client.

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM in view of Kessler et al., Sun Microsystems, 6,681,306 (Hereinafter Kessler-Sun), Eylon et al., AppStream, U.S. Publication 2001/0034736 (Hereinafter Eylon-AppStream) and Srikantan et al., Sun Microsystems, 6,857,130 (Hereinafter Srikantan-Sun).

14. As per claim 6, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. However, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM do not specifically mention about determining, in the device according to a garbage-collection algorithm and whether there is sufficient space in the device to hold the information from the memory before the device transfers the information from the memory to the device.

Kessler-Sun discloses the well-known concept of determining in the device according to a garbage-collection algorithm (e.g., col., 3, lines 14 – 38) and whether there is sufficient space in the device to hold the information from the memory before the device transfers the information from the memory to the device (e.g., col., 3, lines 14 – 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM with the teachings of Kessler-Sun in order to facilitate usage of a garbage-collection algorithm and to check whether there is sufficient space in the device to hold the information from the memory before the device transfers the information from the memory to the device because the garbage collection would help remove unnecessary data from the memory. By checking whether sufficient memory space exist, the software would help handle the information for processing.

Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Kessler-Sun do not specifically mention about purging information from the device when it is determined that there is not sufficient space in the streaming server to hold the information from the buffer.

Eylon-AppStream discloses the well-known concept of purging information from the device when it is determined that there is not sufficient space in the streaming server to hold the information from the buffer (e.g., col., 4, lines 5 – 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Kessler-Sun with the teachings of Eylon-AppStream in order to facilitate purging information from the device when it is determined that there is not sufficient space in the streaming server to hold the information from the buffer because the purging would help regain memory space. The regained memory

space would help provide storage space to the software for the information that needs to be stored.

Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM, Kessler-Sun and Eylon-AppStream do not specifically mention about sending notice of a new client to the streaming server.

Srikantan-Sun discloses the well-known concept of sending notice of a new client to the device (e.g., figure 1, col., 3, lines 39 - 59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM, Kessler-Sun and Eylon-AppStream with the teachings of Srikantan-Sun in order to facilitate sending notice of a new client to the device because the notice would help inform the software. The software would help support the new client.

15. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM in view of Lin et al., Lucent Technologies, 6,405,256 (Hereinafter Lin-Lucent) and "Official Notice".

16. As per claims 7 and 8, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. However Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM do not specifically mention about determining at the first device, a transfer rate from the second device to the first device and a sending rate from the first device to the at least one client apparatus; and comparing the transfer rate to the sending rate.

Lin-Lucent discloses the well-known concept of determining at the first device, a transfer rate from the second device to the first device and a sending rate from the first device to the at

Art Unit: 2154

least one client apparatus (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 – 43), comparing the transfer rate to the sending rate and performing the action when the sending rate is greater than the transfer rate (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 – 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM with the teachings of Lin-Lucent in order to facilitate determining at the first device, a transfer rate from the second device to the first device and a sending rate from the first device to the at least one client apparatus and comparing the transfer rate to the sending rate and performing the action when the sending rate is greater than the transfer rate because the comparison between the two rates would help the software to handle the information based on the transfer rate and the sending rate. Performing the action would help the software to not lose the information for the client.

Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM and Lin-Lucent do not specifically mention about performing the comparing step and waiting a predetermined time period before the device performs the converting step.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of the converting after comparing and waiting a predetermined time period is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include performing the converting after comparing and waiting a predetermined time period with the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM and Lin-Lucent in order to facilitate conversion of information done after the comparison of transfer rates because the comparison would help gather all the information before the information is converted. Waiting a

predetermined time period before the device performs the converting would help the information to be collected in order to support the converting.

17. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM in view of Mattaway et al., NetSpeak Corporation, 6,185,184 (Hereinafter Mattaway-NetSpeak) and Sabeti, Washington, U.S. 2002/0023127 (Hereinafter Sabeti-Washington).

18. As per claims 9 and 10, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. However, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM do not specifically mention about determining in a request handler in the device a number of client requests from the at least one client apparatus for the information and comparing the number of client requests for the information to a threshold number.

Mattaway-NetSpeak discloses the well-known concept of determining in a request handler in the device a number of client requests from the at least one client apparatus for the information (e.g., col., 3, lines 4 – 38) and comparing the number of client requests for the information to a threshold number (e.g., col., 3, lines 4 – 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM with the teachings of Mattaway-NetSpeak in order to facilitate determining number of client requests from the at least one client apparatus for the information and comparing the number of client requests for the information to a threshold number because the software would know how many client requests

have occurred. The software would help perform action when the number of client requests is compared with the threshold number.

Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Mattaway-NetSpeak do not specifically mention about transferring the entire information from the first device to the second device when the number of requests is greater than the threshold number.

Sabeti-Washington teaches the well-known concept of transferring the entire information from the first device to the second device when the number of requests is greater than the threshold number (e.g., col., 2, lines 5 – 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Mattaway-NetSpeak with the teachings of Sabeti-Washington in order to facilitate transferring the entire information from the first device to the second device when the number of requests is greater than the threshold number because the software would help support the number of requests. Having the entire information transferred would help the software to access the entire information in order to support the requests. The entire information would help the software to support the requests based on the information requested in each of the requests.

19. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM in view of Kessler-Sun and Brodersen et al., Siebel Systems, 6,732,111 (Hereinafter Brodersen-Siebel).

20. As per claims 11 and 12, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. However, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM do not specifically mention about determining, in the device according to a garbage-collection algorithm.

Kessler-Sun discloses the well-known concept of determining in the device according to a garbage-collection algorithm (e.g., col., 3, lines 14 – 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM with the teachings of Kessler-Sun in order to facilitate usage of a garbage-collection because the garbage collection would help remove unnecessary data from the memory.

Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Kessler-Sun do not specifically mention about a rate of sending of the file from the device to the client apparatus, comparing the rate of sending to a threshold number, purging the file from the device when the rate of sending is less than the threshold number, wherein the rate of sending is a number of times the file has been sent over a predetermined time period, and the predetermined time period is selected from the group consisting of one minute, one hour, one day, one week, one month, and one year.

Brodersen-Siebel discloses the well-known concept of a rate of sending of the file from the device to the client apparatus (e.g., col., 2, line 4 – col., 3, line 14), comparing the rate of sending to a threshold number (e.g., col., 2, line 4 – col., 3, line 14), purging the file from the device when the rate of sending is less than the threshold number (e.g., col., 3, line 9 – col., 4, line 24), wherein the rate of sending is a number of times the file has been sent over a predetermined time period (e.g., col., 3, line 9 – col., 4, line 24), and the predetermined time

period is selected from the group consisting of one minute, one hour, one day, one week, one month, and one year (e.g., col., 3, line 9 – col., 4, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Kessler-Sun with the teachings of Brodersen-Siebel in order to facilitate comparing a rate of sending of the file from the device to a threshold number for purging when the rate of sending is less than the threshold number because the threshold number would help the software know when to purge the information including the file. The comparison of the rate of sending the file with the threshold number would help the software to handle the information of the device. The predetermined time period would help the software decide when to purge the information from the device.

21. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM in view of Kessler-Sun, Brodersen-Siebel and Gustman, Survivors Foundation, 5,832,499 (Hereinafter Gustman-Survivors).

22. As per claims 13 and 14, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. However, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM do not specifically mention about determining, in the device according to a garbage-collection algorithm.

Kessler-Sun discloses the well-known concept of determining in the device according to a garbage-collection algorithm (e.g., col., 3, lines 14 – 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM with the teachings of Kessler-

Art Unit: 2154

Sun in order to facilitate usage of a garbage-collection because the garbage collection would help remove unnecessary data from the memory.

Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Kessler-Sun do not specifically mention about a rate of sending of the file from the device to the client apparatus, comparing the rate of sending to a threshold number, wherein the rate of sending is a number of times the file has been sent over a predetermined time period, and the predetermined time period is selected from the group consisting of one minute, one hour, one day, one week, one month, and one year.

Brodersen-Siebel discloses the well-known concept of a rate of sending of the file from the device to the client apparatus (e.g., col., 2, line 4 – col., 3, line 14), comparing the rate of sending to a threshold number (e.g., col., 2, line 4 – col., 3, line 14), wherein the rate of sending is a number of times the file has been sent over a predetermined time period (e.g., col., 3, line 9 – col., 4, line 24), and the predetermined time period is selected from the group consisting of one minute, one hour, one day, one week, one month, and one year (e.g., col., 3, line 9 – col., 4, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM and Kessler-Sun with the teachings of Brodersen-Siebel in order to facilitate comparing a rate of sending of the file from the device to a threshold number for purging when the rate of sending is less than the threshold number because the threshold number would help the software to decide on when to purge the information including the file. The comparison of the rate of sending the file with the threshold number would help the software to handle the information of the device. The predetermined time period would help the software decide on purging the information from the device.

Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM, Kessler-Sun and Brodersen-Siebel do not specifically mention about keeping the file stored on the device when the rate of sending is greater than the threshold number.

Gustman-Survivors discloses the well-known concept of keeping the file stored on the device when the rate of sending is greater than the threshold number (e.g., col., 2, lines 3 – 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM, Saxena-IBM, Kessler-Sun and Brodersen-Siebel with the teachings of Gustman-Survivors in order to facilitate keeping the file stored on the device when the rate of sending is greater than the threshold number because the threshold number would help the software to decide on when to not purge the information including the file. The threshold number would help the software decide to not purging the information from the device.

23. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM in view of Thro et al., Motorola, 6,037,991 (Hereinafter Thro-Motorola).

24. As per claim 15, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 1. However, Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM do not specifically mention about determining in a time-division multiplexer program in the device a priority order for sending the information when there are plurality of client apparatus.

Thro-Motorola discloses the well-known concept of determining in a time-division multiplexer program in the device a priority order for sending the information when there are plurality of client apparatus (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 – 42, figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day-IBM and Saxena-IBM with the teachings of Thro-Motorola in order to facilitate usage of a time-division multiplexer program and a priority order for sending the information because the time-division multiplexing would help handle a plurality of clients. The priority order would help software to provide information to the plurality of clients.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Application/Control Number: 09/736,258

Page 18

Art Unit: 2154

Haresh Patel

March 27, 2005

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100